

Attorney Docket No. 10559-391001
Serial No. 09/745,104
Amendment dated July 1, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated April 2, 2004

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

All of the claims stand rejected as either being anticipated by or obvious from Atkins or Atkins in view of Tran. The Office Action takes an interpretation that the claims could cover different loops in different pipelines being executed in parallel with one another. See, for example, page 2 of the Official Action, the last few lines, which summarizes the Office Action's interpretation: that in a multi processor system, several different loops could be executed in parallel with one another, with each loop having its own SETLOOP instruction.

The undersigned has reviewed Atkins, and agrees that it is possible that actions in a multi processor embodiment could have multiple loops with multiple SETLOOP instructions. This is very different than the content of the present system, however, which intends to speed the SETUP of a loop by pipelining multiple commands for a single loop. This is done according to the present system by propagating multiple loop conditions in parallel through multiple different pipelines.

Therefore, in order to obviate the Patent Office's interpretation, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the

Attorney Docket No. 10559-391001
Serial No. 09/745,104
Amendment dated July 1, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated April 2, 2004

different pipelines propagate loop conditions for the same hardware loop. This emphasizes the patentable distinctions relative to Atkins, who does not teach or suggest multiple parallel pipelines propagating information for the same hardware loop conditions. Therefore, claim 1 as amended should obviate the rejections thereto, and therefore claim 1 should be allowable along with the claims which depend therefrom.

Claim 2 has been amended to emphasize that parameters for the loop conditions for the same, first hardware loop are calculated prior to the propagating. It appears that an analogous interpretation of this claim was taken, and therefore these amendments should obviate that interpretation.

Claims 7, 13, 22, 26, 28 have each been amended to obviate the interpretation discussed above. Therefore, each of these claims should be in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent

Attorney Docket No. 10559-391001
Serial No. 09/745,104
Amendment dated July 1, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated April 2, 2004


to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, therefore, all the claim should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect wobble of a set

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account
No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 1, 2004



Scott C. Harris
Attorney for Intel Corporation
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92122
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10411358.doc